UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

	****	DISTRICT OF	NEVA	DA	
MARK BINEGAR,					
Plaintif	f,	JUDGME	NT IN	A CIVIL CASE	
V.		CASE NUM	1BER: 3:	:16-cv-00045-MMD-WGC	
CONNIE BISBEE, et a	al.,				
Defend	ant(s).				
and the jury had not the jury had not the jury had not	ourt. This action cannot a decision has becourt. This action can a decision has been a decision has been a decision has been at the control of the control o	t. me to trial or he en rendered. me to be consid rendered. GED that the co for failure to stat the Court cert	earing before the a cognition in the cognition in the cognition is the cognition of the cognition in the cognition is the cognition of the cognition in the cognition is the cognition of the cog	by jury. The issues have before the Court. The issues have the Court. The issues have the Court. The issues have seen dismissed in its entirety, we izable 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claimany in forma pauperis appears	nave been ve been vith im.
August 4, 2016	<u>.</u> <u>1</u>			LANCE S. WILSON Clerk	
				/s/ K. Rusin Deputy Clerk	